UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/724,941 | 12/01/2003 | Karin Spalink | 9314-50 | 3269 |
| | 7590 03/21/200 L SIBLEY & SAJOVE | EXAMINER | | |
| P.O. BOX 3742 | 28 | VU, THANH T | | |
| RALEIGH, NC 27627 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2174 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/21/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/724,941 | SPALINK ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | / • | | |

| | THANH T. VU | 2174 | |
|---|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>26 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | R ALLOWANCE. | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following r application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance | , or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l | ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | date of the final rejection | n. |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f |). | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl | iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be f | iled within two months | s of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| _ | out prior to the data of filing a brief | will not be entered be | 001100 |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be They raise new issues that would require further core They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | sideration and/or search (see NOT | | cause |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | • | lucing or simplifying tl | ne issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c | orresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | · | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | be entered and an e | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 2, 4-10, 16, 17, 19-25, 32, 32, 34-40</u> . | and 47 40 | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | <u>апи +7-+9</u> . | | |
| <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but | hefore or on the date of filing a No | tice of Δnneal will not | · he entered |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| /David A Wilay/ | | | |
| /David A Wiley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174 | | | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's primary argument is that Acuri does not teach "displaying the first menu as a first rectangular array having plural rows and plural of columns". The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given >their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

In this case, Arcuri reads on the claim language of displaying the first menu as a first rectangular array (fig. 2A; menu 100; fig. 2A. shows a first rectangular array (i.e. menu 100)) having plural of rows (fig. 2A; menu 100; each menu item (i.e. Print Layout, Web Layout...) occupies a row) and plural of columns (fig. 2A; menu 100 shows a column for icons and a column for text descriptions of menu items).